

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 15, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 9, and 19; allowed claims 6-8, 13-18, and 24; and objected to claims 3-5, 10-12, and 20-23. Claims 1, 9, 19 have been amended, and claims 2, 3, 10, and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the filing of one or more divisional or continuation applications based on the subject matter of these claims. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-21, and 23-24 remain pending in the application (9 independent, 20 total). Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following Remarks.

### A. Oath/Declaration

The Examiner asserts that the oath or declaration is defective. Specifically, the Examiner suggests that it does not identify the mailing or post office address of the inventor. Applicant disagrees, and respectfully submits that the declaration clearly includes the mailing address of the inventor (which is identical to the P.O. address, in this instance), as shown in the image of the signature block, reproduced below.

Full name of first inventor: Paul A. LaBerge  
Inventor's signature: Paul A. LaBerge Date: 01-09-2001  
Residence Address: 5772 Ridge Creek Rd Ct  
City/State: Shoreview, MN Zip Code: 55126  
Citizenship: USA

Accordingly, Applicant requests that Examiner's objection to the declaration be withdrawn.

**B. Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the disclosure because it includes the phrase "the present invention." A revised Abstract addressing this informality is included herewith.

**C. Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 9, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,497,498 (the "Taylor reference"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Taylor reference does not disclose each and every element of the claims as amended. For example, the Taylor reference does not disclose a system including a supplemental information device configured to store supplemental information comprising SPD configuration information related to the memory module as recited in amended claim 1 and as similarly recited in the remaining independent claims.

In accordance with the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejections be withdrawn.

**D. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 6-8, 13-18, and 24 are allowed. Claims 3-5, 10-12, and 20-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Accordingly, claims 1, 9, and 19 (the independent claims associated with these claims) have been amended such that claims 3-5, 1-12, and 20-23 should now be in condition for allowance.

**E. Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submitted that the foregoing remarks fully address the Examiner's objections, and that all of the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, are patentable over the art of record, and are in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Allowance respecting all pending claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail, then the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 1/15/04

By   
Daniel R. Pote  
Reg. No. 43,011

**SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.**  
One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
(602) 382-6325